

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/029,464	BEST-DEVEREUX, IGOR	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Robert D. Rines	3626	

**All Participants:**

(1) Robert D. Rines.

(2) Jens Jenkins (Reg. #44,803).

**Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_**

(3) Jeffery A. Smith SPE AU 3625.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 September 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☐ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Claims 1 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Klaus (US 7,080,020) in view of Sweeney et al. (2002/0032646)*

Claims discussed:

*1 and 40*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Klaus, Sweeney et al., and Erlanger (US 6,594,635)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative agreed to cancel claims 22-39 and allow by Examiner's Amendment, amendments to claims 1 and 40 to incorporate the "user interface" feature recited in claim 52 to facilitate allowance of claims 1-12, 40-48, and 51-52. Specifically, the negotiation interface features of claim 52 were required by Examiner to overcome the Klaus and Sweeney references and further to patentably distinguish the instant invention from the Erlanger reference identified by the Examiner. .